## LGBT PIC

### A: CP Text

**The USFG ought to make National Service compulsory within the fields of Civilian and Military service except for Queer Folk**

### B: N/B

**It’s Competitive- Although it’s possible to do the AFF, it would be undesirable.**

#### 1. The AFF forces LGBT people fight for a country that never understood or accepted them. Queer people are used as scapegoats who constantly sacrifice their life for others.

**Foust 13’** Foust, Joshua. “What It's Like to Be Gay in the Ultra-Masculine NatSec Community.” Foreign Policy, Foreign Policy, 30 Sept. 2015, foreignpolicy.com/2015/09/30/what-its-like-to-be-gay-in-the-ultra-masculine-natsec-community/.

The **NatSec community has** a long **history of troubled relations with** its **LGBT members.** From the start of the Cold War, **officials have thought of gays as a security risk on par with communists.** In the early 1950s, Joseph McCarthy **view**ed **homosexuality as** being equally, if not more, **subversive to American values** as the hammer and sickle, freely mixing his disdain for liberalism with his revulsion for gay men and women. In one press conference, he told reporters, “If you want to be against McCarthy, boys, you’ve got to be either a Communist or a cocksucker.” It was the suspected communists (mostly at the State Department) who we more commonly remember as McCarthy’s victims, but he persecuted LGBT people during the “lavender scare” in far greater numbers than he did any alleged Soviet sympathizers. By 1953, the State Department had fired more than 400 “perverts,” as the media called them, as compared to around 100 suspected communists. Public opinion about alleged communist sympathizers in the government changed after McCarthy’s fall from power; government attitudes toward homosexuality did not. President Dwight Eisenhower codified the government’s stance against employing those inclined toward “sexual perversion” (meaning: homosexuality) in Executive Order 10450. The Eisenhower logic was that homosexuality was so inherently abhorrent that it could be used as a means of blackmail — that being gay meant a person was subject to coercion by a hostile intelligence agency, and thus could never be trusted in government. It wasn’t until 1975 that the U.S. Civil Service Commission officially allowed, on a limited basis, gays and lesbians to openly hold some federal jobs — but not in national security. **The CIA and Pentagon** had translated Eisenhower’s order into a practice of **hunting down and weeding out** closeted **gay and lesbian employees**. **Such deep prejudice** was not confined to security agencies located in the suburbs of Virginia — it **carried over into Congress** as well, such as when, in the early 1980s, Sen. Sam Nunn, a Democrat, summarily fired two of his aides for being gay, on the grounds that they could not get the clearance to handle classified matters. (Gays and lesbians were barred from holding security clearance until 1995.) I deployed to Afghanistan a few months later to support some Human Terrain Teams, and my experience with the colonel prompted me to keep my sexual identity a secret. At the Combat Readiness Center in Fort Benning, Georgia, there were only group showers — not the biggest deal in the universe, but I was terrified of someone causing me grief if he knew I was gay and showering next to him. The gruff, **performative masculinity** of war deployment **doesn’t** necessarily **create a welcoming environment** for LGBT people.

#### 2. The military creates an ideal standard of masculinity that the Queer body can’t occupy

**Alt 15’** Alt, Marcus Christopher. The Experiences of Gay, Military Men and the Impact on One' s Sense of Masculinity. University of Iowa, 2015, ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6271&context=etd.

**Notions of masculinity** were present throughout society and culture, and individuals were inundated with positive and negative examples of masculinity all the time. Though it was certainly not alone **in** communicating ideal masculinity, **the military**, with its broad reach and institutional power, **had** a significant, and growing, **impact on the norms of the nation.** The militarization of the nation had great influence in shaping the masculine ideal of the WWII and Postwar Eras in a number of ways, including through training, GI benefits, shared experiences, and the reputation men would receive from service. I focus on the latter aspect, specifically on the creation of a valorous masculine culture ascribed to American servicemen. The perceived vital role of men in pushing forth the American way in the face of Fascist and Communist threats was not limited to active service in the military or jobs in the defense industry. For a nation becoming increasingly militarized in the face of the specter of existential threats, the strength, courage, and intelligence of the men in an all-male military was essential to keeping freedom and liberty intact. **The culture** created **by the military encouraged the importance of** these **men in** all of their **roles in society.** Men who did not serve or had returned from service were understood as heads of their families and part of the capitalist system; which was engaged in its own ideological war with the Communist world. These dual roles of nationalistic manhood — often two stages in a man’s post-adolescent life — would define men’s role in society through the immediate postwar era and into the sixties. The military's vast production of cultural propaganda were steeped in ideals of hegemonic masculinity and helped set examples for soldiers to follow, while also broadcasting messages about soldiers to the general population. The **masculine ideal** put forth in these defense materials were largely **based upon** very traditional, white, middle class masculinity that exuded aggression and strength, but also control and gentility. The American military was composed of men from all different races, classes, backgrounds, temperaments, and sexualities. However, imagery surrounding these men exhibited in film, advertisements, and federal productions, show a very narrow scope of men — **white, middle class,** well-built, **straight, and cissexual.** **Men who did not meet this ideal** - people of color, the working class, homosexuals, and disabled - were not only excluded from the imagery put forth by the government, but **were** also often **barred from service or denied the econ**omic **benefits of their service.** Their exclusion from imagery associated with American manhood and heroism denied them mainstream idyllic masculinity, as put forth by the federal government. Masculine norms were challenged and contested, particularly from those men marginalized by these policies, but the narrative put forth by the federal government was devoid of these nuances and alternative masculinities. By injecting these white, male, middle class norms into the materials, the military stood to benefit in a number of ways. Primarily, it presented an idealized and unproblematic image of the military-industrial complex that cities could be proud of and comfortable with. It hid the ugliness of war and the contradictions men often faced throughout their service, and served as a barrier to criticism of policies and actions. The nation rallied their support behind a military that was defined through media as being an ideal hegemonic male, establishing and reifying an unattainable image of masculinity. By producing media material that put forth the American soldier as a hero, these military publications also put forth ideas about what was normative, and aligned, as Aaron Belkin argued, white-male-straight-man with American-military-empire. Belkin found that the military's treatment of masculinity and heterosexuality was used as a tool to ease the ugliness of empire with 'purified' troops of unquestionable morality. Secondarily, the communication of unattainable masculinity, packed in the American white, straight, well-built American soldier fueled existing power dynamics that marginalized alternative cultures that could potentially cause disruptions in a society in crisis